

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/466,935	LIVSHITS ET AL.
	Examiner David J. Steadman	Art Unit 1656

All Participants:

(1) David J. Steadman.

Status of Application: response to non-final rejection filed on 9/8/09

(3) _____.

(2) Ms. Shelly Guest Cermak.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 December 2009

Time: approximately 3 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Daniels et al. (Science 257:771-778, 1992), cited in the outstanding obviousness rejection

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J. Steadman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1656

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner noted that a copy of the Daniels et al. reference (Science 257:771-778, 1992) was not attached to the Office action mailed on 3/9/09 because the examiner was under the impression that the Daniels et al. reference was already of record in the application file. The examiner inadvertently read the Daniels et al. citation in the IDS filed on 5/31/00 as being the same as Daniels et al. (Science 257:771-778, 1992), cited in the obviousness rejection. However, upon further review, the two references are not the same. Since a copy of the Daniels et al. (Science 257:771-778, 1992) reference was not made available to applicant and in the interest of customer service, the examiner questioned applicant as to whether a final or non-final rejection would be preferable. Applicant preferred a non-final rejection.